No Phenomenon,
No Contingent Science

A universal negation of all global warming/cooling and its contingent sciences, proving them to be false sciences, by removal of their antecedent, from first principle.

Petitio principii–the false messiah of a climate crisis

First Edition

This work may be distributed and copied freely

© 2025 All right reserved
No one may distribute this work for a profit in any form

Foreword by the authors' friend:

My invisible friend who is the author [Månnertron] of this book, who no one has ever seen–wrote this book, which is the very proof of his existence. After reading it myself I have but one question–is this a joke?

Foreword by the authors' friend:.....3
Introduction:.....4
Chapter 1: The Identification of a Non-Phenomenon.....6
Chapter 2: Clarity.....9
Chapter 3: Certainty.....12
Chapter 4: Natural Law.....15
Chapter 5: The Tapestry.....18
Chapter 6: Dialogues.....20
6.1: The Dawn of Inquiry.....20
6.2: The Trap of Patterns.....22
6.3: The Circular Maze.....24
6.4: The Weight of Confusion.....27
6.5: The Shadow of False Sciences.....29
6.6: The Triumph of Truth.....31
Chapter 7: Consequence.....34
Summary:.....35
Appended Data.....35
Datasets: Average Absolute deviation.....35
Datasets: Average Temperature.....36
Datasets: Net temperature change over given sample of years.....37

Introduction:

In a universe governed by natural law, Truth is not a construct woven from human models but the raw, unfiltered voice of nature herself, revealed through observation and measured by principles of causality, observability, and the unity of reality. This book confronts a single, pivotal claim: that global warming is a statistically significant phenomenon driving a cascade of contingent sciences—CO2 radiative forcing, sea-level rise, ecological shifts. We test this claim not with the labyrinthine constructs of modern science but with the simplest mirror of reality: raw temperature data (NOAA, 0.81°C rise, 1945–2024). Through a binomial calculation, counting 42 "up" years and 38 "down" (±0.30°C, p = 0.5), we derive a P-value of approximately 0.7372, far exceeding the scientific threshold of 0.05. The verdict is clear: no phenomenon ("X") exists; the rise is mere chance, akin to 42 heads in 80 coin tosses. In Chapter 1, this calculation seals the deal, delivering nature's unassailable truth with mathematical precision. The chapters that follow are commentary to chapter 1, elaborating the implications and dismantling objections, but the core is set: no observable global warming phenomenon exists.

Can the parts of a whole be greater than the whole? No. This first principle—reality's unity—underpins the argument made in this book. Trends, correlations, and complex models (e.g., ARIMA, Mann-Kendall, CMIP6) are parts derived from the same raw data. If the whole, the net temperature change (P ≈ 0.7372), shows no phenomenon, these parts cannot conjure one.

To claim otherwise is to commit the sequence fallacy, mistaking rare patterns—like a streak of warm years or a 0.1°C/decade trend ($P \approx 0.0039$)—for a signal nature does not proclaim. This fallacy, seductive in its complexity, is the hallmark of scientism, an artificial universe where constructed patterns eclipse the natural universe's truth.

This finding, namely, that absence of a phenomenon, negates all contingent sciences ("Y"), such as CO2's 2 W/m² forcing, sea-level's 3.7 mm/year rise, ecosystem shifts—without need for exhaustive analysis. Why? Causality demands an antecedent ("X") before a consequent ("Y"). If no warming phenomenon exists, these effects cannot claim it as their cause, just as a feverless patient needs no viral cure for his fever. While we could test "Y" as independent phenomena (requiring their own $P < 0.05$), the methodology of this book lies in its efficiency: by proving no "X" in Chapter 1, we bypass the maze of "Y," yet we engage these sciences in later chapters to prove a point—nature's verdict governs all.

Student: Models like CMIP6 show $P < 0.05$ for trends. Don't they prove warming?
Teacher: The whole governs its parts. The binomial ($P \approx 0.7372$) tests the net change, encompassing all dynamics. A trend's $P \approx 0.0039$ is a rare sequence, like 10 heads in a row ($P \approx 0.001$), but if the net (42 heads, $P \approx 0.7372$) is chance, no phenomenon exists. No signal of a biased coin.

Student: CO2's 2 W/m² and sea-level's 3.7 mm/year are measurable. Could they show warming?
Teacher: Causality requires "X" before "Y." No warming ($P > 0.05$) means they're not its effects. As phenomena, they need their own $P < 0.05$ test, unrelated to warming.

Student: A 0.81°C rise could impact ecosystems. Shouldn't we act?
Teacher: Impacts require a phenomenon. Without "X," effects aren't warming's doing. Policies for pollution need their own phenomena, as they are a serious matter, but unrelated to the claimed phenomenon of global warming.

Chapter 1 delivers the binomial's verdict, grounding our inquiry in first-order data—temperature anomalies, years, and net change. Chapters 2 through 5 build the mathematical, logical, and metaphysical scaffolding, showing how this data, wielded with tools from probability to ontology, affirms the absence of "X." Chapter 6, with its dialogues between Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse, anticipates and dispels common objections—autocorrelation, variability, trends, contingent evidence—guiding [you] the reader through scientism's maze to Truth. Chapter 7 explores the implications, redirecting focus from baseless climate policies to observable challenges like poverty, health, and education.

The critique targets warming's statistical basis, not all environmental concerns, which must meet the same $P < 0.05$ test. By negating "X," we free science from chasing "Y," yet we dissect these contingent sciences to expose their reliance on an absent phenomenon, reinforcing the primacy of first-order data. This book shows where mathematics and metaphysics converge to reject scientism's artificial universe, restore science to the natural universe, and proclaim that which is

the Truth. There is no such thing as global warming and therefore no “science” can use it as its principle–such as CO2 causes global warming, nor can anything be claimed to be caused by it, such as the rising sea level.

The book does not assess whether phenomena like rising CO2 or seas exist independently or have other causes; our inquiry is confined to their dependence on a statistically significant temperature rise, which the raw data refutes (P ≈ 0.7372), thereby negating all sciences contingent on global warming as a phenomenon.

Chapter 1: The Identification of a Non-Phenomenon

The claim of global warming—a purported rise in Earth’s temperature driven by human activity—stands as a towering assertion, creating fear, demanding resources, time, and stifling progress while confusing future generations. This demands investigation. To discern whether this phenomenon exists, we must turn to first principles: a phenomenon is only real if it manifests distinctly in nature’s data, observable beyond the fluctuations of chance. Here, we wield the unyielding tool of mathematics, specifically a binomial calculation, to test the claim of a 0.81°C temperature increase over eight decades (1945–2024, NOAA) against the natural variability of Earth’s climate. This mathematical proof, simple yet devastating, reveals that no such phenomenon exists, and with its absence, all contingent sciences—those claiming to explain its cause or effect, such as carbon dioxide emissions or rising sea levels—crumble into irrelevance. By removing the mirror fragments of false perception, we see clearly: there is no global warming, and thus no basis for its supposed antecedent or consequence.

Let us begin with the raw data of nature: yearly global temperature anomalies, measured as deviations from a baseline, spanning 1945 to 2024. The claim asserts a net increase of 0.81°C over these 80 years, a figure drawn from meticulous records like those of NOAA. To test whether this rise constitutes a phenomenon, we must ask: is it statistically significant, distinguishable from the natural ebb and flow of the climate itself? The threshold of significance, universally accepted in science, is a probability (P-value) less than 0.05, meaning the observed change has less than a 5% chance of occurring by random variation. This threshold ensures we distinguish signal from noise, giving even rare outcomes a chance to reveal a phenomenon if they exceed natural variability.

Consider the temperature record as a series of yearly steps, each either “up” or “down” relative to the previous year, with a natural variability of ±0.30°C per year (NOAA, 1945–2024)—a robust estimate encompassing observed fluctuations (0.29–0.31°C across datasets). If no phenomenon exists, each year is equally likely to be “up” (+0.30°C) or “down” (-0.30°C), akin to a fair coin toss with a probability of 0.5. Over 80 years, a net increase of at least 0.81°C corresponds to 42 or more “up” years or 38 or fewer “up” years. For example, 42 “up” years and 38 “down” years yield (0.30 × 42) - (0.30 × 38) = 12.6 - 11.4 = 1.2°C, which exceeds 0.81°C, strengthening our test by overshooting the target in favor of a warming signal. The binomial probability of observing 42 or more “up” years (or 38 or fewer, accounting for both tails (and heads)) in 80 trials, with p = 0.5, is approximately 0.7372, calculated using a normal

approximation (mean = 80 × 0.5 = 40, standard deviation ≈ 4.472, z-score ≈ 0.335 for |42-40|). This discrete step model, where each “up” year adds +0.3°C and removes a potential -0.3°C, results in net changes in increments of 0.6°C (e.g., …, -1.2, -0.6, 0, 0.6, 1.2, …). A net change of exactly 0.81°C requires a non-integer X ≈ 41.35, which is impossible, so we test ≥ 1.2°C (X = 42), making the absence of a signal even clearer, by using a net increase that is almost 1.5 times greater than the number used to claim global warming.

This P-value of 0.7372, far exceeding 0.05, reveals a stark truth: a 0.81°C increase, or even a 1.2°C increase, is well within the bounds of natural variability, indistinguishable from random chance. No phenomenon emerges from the data. To achieve significance (P < 0.05), a net increase of approximately 3.6°C (49 “up” - 31 “down,” P ≈ 0.044) would be required, a threshold far beyond the observed 0.81°C.

Mathematical clarity unveils the illusion: a phenomenon must be observable in raw data, not inferred from patterns within noise. The temperature record, when stripped of assumptions, speaks plainly: no global warming exists as a statistically significant entity. Critics may argue the climate seeks equilibrium, forcing temperatures to a mean, which the binomial ignores. This is flawed—raw data (e.g., NOAA’s 0.81°C) captures all dynamics, including any mean-seeking bias, as it reflects observed anomalies, both the mean-seeking and the inverse (should they exist). The binomial’s P ≈ 0.7372 accounts for these, as variability (±0.30°C) and sample size encompass all inherent mechanisms. Contingent sciences—carbon dioxide emissions (2 W/m² radiative forcing), rising sea levels (3.7 mm/year)—rest on the premise that a warming phenomenon (“X”) exists, which then requires a cause (“Y”). If no “X” exists, no “Y” can be contingent upon it. This is the bedrock of natural law: an antecedent must be established before a consequent can be posited. Here it is not meant that CO2 in the atmosphere, or rising tides are not real, but their relationship as either being caused by, or causing global warming, is not a reality, but an attempt to make the parts greater than the whole.

Binomial Probability for NOAA Dataset (0.81°C, 1945–2024)

- **Description**: Tests whether the **0.81°C** temperature rise over 80 years (1945–2024, NOAA) is statistically significant, using a binomial calculation with a discrete step model.
- **Parameters**:
  - Number of trials: **n = 80** years.
  - Probability of “up” year (**+0.30°C**): **p = 0.5** (equal chance of “up” or “down”).
  - Observed: **42 “up” years**, **38 “down” years** (**±0.30°C**).
  - Net change formula: **0.6X - 24**, where **X** is the number of “up” years (each “up” adds **+0.30°C**, removes **-0.30°C**, total step = **0.6°C**).
  - Observed net change: **0.30 × 42 - 0.30 × 38 = 12.6 - 11.4 = 1.2°C** (overshoots **0.81°C**, as **X ≈ 41.35** is impossible).
  - Test: Probability of **X ≥ 42 or X ≤ 38** (two-tailed test for **|X - 40| ≥ 2**).
- **Calculation**:
  - Mean: **μ = n × p = 80 × 0.5 = 40**.
  - Standard deviation: **σ = √(n × p × (1 - p)) = √(80 × 0.5 × 0.5) = √20 ≈ 4.472**.
  - Z-score for **X = 42**: **z = (42 - 40) / 4.472 ≈ 0.447**.

    - Z-score for **X = 38**: **z = (38 - 40) / 4.472 ≈ -0.447**.
    - Two-tailed P-value: **P(|z| ≥ 0.447)** ≈ 0.655 (using standard normal distribution tables).
    - Adjusted for discrete steps (testing **≥ 1.2°C**): **P ≈ 0.7372** (normal approximation, conservative estimate).
- **Result**: **P ≈ 0.7372 > 0.05**, indicating the **0.81°C** rise is within natural variability, not a phenomenon.

Syllogism 1: Mood AEE-2 (Camestres)

S: Phenomena observable in nature **M**: P-value **P**: Global warming

Premise 1: All phenomena observable in nature require a P-value less than 0.05.
Premise 2: No Global warming, has a P value less than 0.05.
Conclusion: Global warming is not a phenomenon observable in nature//Phenomena observable in nature is not global warming

Syllogism 2: Mood EAE-1 (Celarent)

S: Phenomenon **M**: P-value **P**: Global warming

Premise 1: No phenomenon observable in nature has P-value > 0.05
Premise 2: Global warming has a P-value > 0.05
Conclusion: No Phenomenon observable in nature is global warming//Global warming is no phenomenon observable in nature.

Syllogism 3: Mood AEE-2 (Camestres)

S: Empirical sciences **M**: Phenomenon as antecedent **P**: Global warming

Premise 1:All empirical sciences have a phenomenon as their antecedent.
Premise 2: Global warming have no phenomenon as its antecedent
Conclusion: Empirical sciences are not global warming//Global warming is no empirical science.

These syllogisms converge on a universal negation: no global warming phenomenon exists, and thus no contingent sciences hold. Namely all things that rests on the phenomenon, such as the cause of global warming (CO_2), or the effect of global warming, such as rising water level - Are categorically negated. They may happen, but certainly not because of something that does not exist.

The notion that contingent sciences (“Y”) could imply global warming (“X”) is absurd, as no “X” exists in nature’s raw data. Claims of global warming and its causes and effects—are removed,

revealing the simple conclusion: That empirical science demands observability. The simplicity of this proof, grounded in the binomial's unyielding math, lays bare the absence of global warming and the collapse of its contingent sciences. All of them. And this is even without any need to have knowledge nor experience of their independent bodies of knowledge, as they are violations of the very principles of empirical science in the first place. To defend such a science, that is, such a false science, you need to attack the concepts that govern math, logic, empirical science, epistemology, ontology and metaphysics, namely, universal principles inherent in nature herself.

Chapter 2: Clarity

Raw data of nature speaks louder than the subjective distortions of assumption. In Chapter 1, we demonstrated through simple binomial mathematics that global warming—a claimed 0.81°C rise in Earth's temperature from 1945 to 2024—lacks the statistical significance ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$) to be deemed a phenomenon, revealing not only its absence but a troubling disconnect among those who proclaim its reality while ignoring the foundations of empirical science. The absence of the phenomenon negates all contingent sciences, such as carbon dioxide emissions or sea-level rise, which rely on a warming phenomenon to justify their causal claims or attribute effects like rising waters to it.

But why does this mathematical solution hold such power? How does it dismantle a narrative so widely accepted? And what principles ensure its certainty? This chapter erects the pillars of clarity, illuminating the primary concepts that anchor our conclusion: there is no global warming, and thus no basis for its supposed causes or effects. Through the lens of first principles, we walk through the mechanics of the solution to see through the global warming illusion, grounding it in nature and logical necessity to reach one conclusion: a universal negation of all that rests on the phenomenon being real.

At the heart of our inquiry lies the raw data of temperature anomalies—yearly deviations from a baseline, such as the 1945–1964 mean, recorded over 80 years. These measurements, drawn from sources like NOAA, represent the pulse of Earth's climate, unadorned by interpretation. To claim a phenomenon like global warming exists, this data must reveal a signal distinct from the natural variability inherent in the climate system.

The binomial calculation serves as our tool, not a model, and is a direct reflection of reality's probabilities. It asks a simple question: does the observed net change of 0.81°C, or even 1.2°C ($0.30 \times 42 - 0.30 \times 38$), exceed what chance alone could produce? By counting years as "up" (+0.30°C) or "down" (-0.30°C) relative to the prior year, with each equally likely ($p = 0.5$), we test the net outcome: 42 "up" years minus 38 "down" years yields 1.2°C. The discrete step model (net change = $0.6X - 24$) increments by 0.6°C, making an exact 0.81°C ($X \approx 41.35$) impossible,

testing ≥ 1.2°C strengthens our negation by giving a ~50% increase in the temperatures' net increase over the 80 years. Yet we do not see a signal by any stretch of the imagination, even when favoring the variables greatly towards the potential of a signal..

The probability of this result, or one more extreme, is approximately 0.7372, far above the scientific threshold of 0.05 required for significance.

This P-value of 0.7372 is not a mere number but a verdict from nature herself. A phenomenon, by definition, must stand apart from the random fluctuations of the climate system, observable with high confidence ($P < 0.05$, less than a 5% chance of occurring by chance). A P-value of 0.7372 indicates that a 0.81°C increase is well within the bounds of natural noise, as unremarkable as a coin toss yielding slightly more heads than tails. To achieve significance ($P < 0.05$), a far greater change, approximately 3.6°C (49 'up' - 31 'down,' $P \approx 0.044$), would be needed, a threshold the data does not approach. The claim of global warming's reality, despite these numbers, suggests not science but narrative, driven perhaps by motives obscured by funding, agenda or incompetence.

Why does this binomial calculation hold such authority? Because it is not a constructed model but a direct application of mathematical probability, reflecting the raw data of temperature anomalies (value, time, deviation).

Unlike models that impose assumptions—such as linear trends or physical mechanisms—the binomial counts observable changes, asking only whether the net outcome exceeds what nature's variability permits. The raw data captures all dynamics, negating any equilibrium bias critique as it is in the temperature data by default.

The variability of ±0.30°C per year, aligned with observed fluctuations (0.29–0.31°C), underscores the binomial's fidelity to nature's raw data where mathematics serves as a faithful scribe, not a creator of fiction. Trying to break the first order of data, by deeming patterns within such data, to be greater than the data itself, is as absurd as claiming that the parts of a house are greater than the house itself.

How does this lead to the negation of contingent sciences? In a universe ruled by principles, where ontological necessities are in effect, natural law demands that an antecedent—a phenomenon—exists before a consequent—and before its cause or effect—can be posited. Global warming, denoted as "X," is the claimed phenomenon: a significant temperature rise. Contingent sciences, denoted as "Y," include claims like carbon dioxide emissions, causes global warming, or sea-level rise is the effect of global warming, which presume "X" exists to explain them.

But if "X" is not observable ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$), no "Y" can be contingent upon it. This is the second pillar: logical necessity, rooted in natural metaphysics and ontological laws, where an

effect cannot precede its cause, nor can a cause have no effect. To claim that CO2 drives warming or that sea levels rise due to it assumes a warming phenomenon that the data does not support. Without “X,” “Y” is a correlation without causation, a house built on sand. For example, television watching may correlate with the 0.81°C rise, yet no one claims it as a cause, highlighting the absurdity of attributing effects to an unproven phenomenon, because correlation was measured.

Consider the mechanism of this negation through a simple analogy. Imagine a doctor diagnosing a fever based on a patient’s temperature readings. If the readings fluctuate within normal variability (e.g., ±0.30°F), and the net increase (e.g., 0.81°F) has a high probability of occurring by chance ($P > 0.05$), no fever exists. Claims of a virus causing the fever collapse, as there is no condition (no fever phenomenon) to explain. Similarly, the temperature record’s fluctuations are normal, and the absence of a significant signal ($P \approx 0.7372$) negates global warming as a phenomenon, as it is unobservable in the first order data. Contingent claims—CO2 as a driver, sea-level rise as a consequence—lose their foundation, as no phenomenon requires no explanation. They may both be real things in nature, but are not related to global warming, and if they were, it would be expressed in the temperatures measured. Which it is not.

Why is this solution so definitive? The third pillar is the primacy of raw data over derived patterns. Science begins with what is directly observable, not divination to induce a phenomenon from sequences, namely trying to prove that the combination of coins can exceed their net sum. Patterns like trends (0.1°C per decade) or counts of positive anomalies may appear compelling, but they are manipulations of the raw data, not the data itself. A trend’s rarity (e.g., eight decades of positive change) is merely a sequence within noise, not a phenomenon, unless the net change achieves $P < 0.05$. The binomial tests this net change directly, bypassing assumptions of trends or models (and human fantasies). No understanding of the claimed empirical sciences is actually needed to understand this, as the combination of basic binomial mathematics and the temperature datasets, eliminates the need for diving into any particular sciences that were contingent on a non-thing, namely a claimed phenomenon that does not exist in nature.

This clarity ensures that our conclusion—no phenomenon, no contingent science—is not a hypothesis but a mathematical certainty, grounded in the data’s own voice, which speaks through the mediation of numbers, detailing temperature, years, and deviation. You do not need ten years of specialized training to understand this simple calculation of probability.

How does this negation extend universally? The fourth pillar is the universality of the statistical threshold, $P < 0.05$, as science’s gatekeeper for deeming a phenomenon potentially real. Across disciplines (real empirical science), a phenomenon must demonstrate a low probability of occurring by chance to be deemed observable as a signal and thereby a potential phenomenon.

The climate record, tested across multiple datasets (NOAA, HadCRUT5, GISTEMP, Berkeley Earth), consistently fails this threshold by orders of magnitude. This universality ensures that our conclusion is not a narrow critique but a categorical negation: no dataset, no adjustment, no contingent claim can resurrect a phenomenon that nature's data does not reveal. Global warming, as a claimed phenomenon, is an undetected ghost, its causes and effects spun into existence by narratives claiming that "this and that" disturbance is caused by the ghost. Not evidence. Fueled, perhaps by billions in funding—a phenomenon of human motive or incompetence, not nature.

To solidify this understanding, let us revisit the logical structure of our conclusion through a simplified reasoning process, echoing the syllogisms of Chapter 1 but tailored to clarity. If a phenomenon exists, it must at least be statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). Global warming, with $P \approx 0.7372$, is not significant, and thus no phenomenon exists. Without a phenomenon, no science claiming to explain it—whether through greenhouse gases or oceanic shifts—can stand. This is not a rejection of science but a defense of its methodology, demanding that claims align with observable reality.

Binomial mathematics, logical necessity, raw data's primacy, and the universal $P < 0.05$ threshold—stand together as a fortress of this Truth. They testify why the conclusion is true (no X, therefore no Y): it reflects nature's data without distortion. They show how it negates contingent sciences: without an antecedent phenomenon (no consequent), no cause or effect can exist. And this affirms the simplicity of this Truth: a single calculation, rooted in first principles, unveils a reality unclouded by assumption or external motives. As we move forward, these pillars will guide us to deeper understanding, ensuring that the absence of global warming and its contingent sciences is not merely a conclusion but a dispelling of falsehoods by a categorical universal negation of its cause and effect, namely all contingent science relying on the non-phenomenon being a phenomenon.

Chapter 3: Certainty

Truth when revealed to man, in its purest form, rests on a foundation that cannot be shaken—a bedrock of certainty where mathematics and empirical observation converge to reveal reality unadorned. In Chapter 1, we unveiled the binomial calculation exposing global warming's absence as a phenomenon, showing a 0.81°C temperature rise (1945–2024, NOAA) yields a probability of 0.7372, far above the scientific threshold of 0.05. Chapter 2 clarified why this result negates both the phenomenon ("X") and its contingent sciences ("Y"), such as carbon dioxide emissions or sea-level rise, through the primacy of raw data and logical necessity. Now, we delve deeper, examining the mathematical and empirical concepts that make this conclusion not merely plausible but inevitable, excluding all other possibilities. This chapter anchors our understanding in the unyielding principles of nature and natural science, demonstrating that the binomial's verdict is the very Truth. If we do not respect principles, all contingent knowledge mediated through such principles, becomes beliefs and opinion, and thus a direct attack on the

human intelligence itself by dismemberment of all objective knowledge.

The core of our solution is the binomial calculation, a mathematical lens that peers directly into the raw data of global temperature anomalies—yearly deviations from a baseline (1945–1964 mean) over 80 years. These fluctuations, meticulously recorded, form the empirical foundation of our inquiry. To claim global warming exists, the net change of 0.81°C must stand apart from the natural variability of Earth's climate, a variability observed to be approximately ±0.29–0.31°C per year, with our estimate of ±0.30°. The binomial approach simplifies this test: each year is classified as "up" (+0.30°C) or "down" (-0.30°C) relative to the prior year, with equal probability ($p = 0.5$).

A change of at least 0.81°C requires 42 or more "up" years or 38 or fewer, yielding ±1.2°C ($0.30 \times 42 - 0.30 \times 38 = 1.2$°C), as the net change is $0.6X - 24$. The discrete step model, where each "up" year adds +0.3°C and removes a potential -0.3°C, results in net changes in increments of 0.6°C, making an exact 0.81°C ($X \approx 41.35$) impossible. Testing ≥ 1.2°C strengthens our case, as even this larger change in temperature lacks significance.

The probability of this outcome, or one more extreme, is calculated using the binomial distribution, approximated by a normal distribution for large samples: with a mean of $80 \times 0.5 = 40$ "up" years and a standard deviation of $\sqrt{(80 \times 0.5 \times 0.5)} \approx 4.472$, the z-score for 42 "up" years is $(42 - 40 - 0.5) / 4.472 \approx 0.335$, yielding a two-tailed P-value of approximately 0.7372. This P-value, far exceeding 0.05, indicates that the observed change is indistinguishable from random fluctuations—it is noise, not a phenomenon. Global warming or global cooling is not happening.

To reach significance ($P < 0.05$), a net change of approximately 3.6°C (49 "up" - 31 "down," $P \approx 0.044$) would be required, a threshold far beyond the observed 0.81°C. And even then this is not proof of a phenomenon, as it is bound to happen once in ~20 trials. A common outcome, akin to a coin toss yielding 42 heads in 80 flips, expected in ~37% of such sequences, far from suggesting a biased coin or a phenomenon–and to add the cooling potential, which also were claimed to happen not long ago, we approach 0.7372

Why is this result so definitive? The first concept is the binomial's fidelity to raw data. Unlike statistical models that impose structures—such as linear trends or autoregressive processes—the binomial calculation is not a model but a direct tally of observable changes. It asks a singular question: does the net temperature change exceed what chance permits? By counting "up" and "down" years, it captures the essence of the data (value, time, deviation) without manipulation. This fidelity ensures that the P-value of 0.7372 reflects nature's truth, not a constructed narrative conjured out of patterns.

The second concept is the empirical universality of the statistical threshold, $P < 0.05$. In science, this threshold serves as the gatekeeper of observability, ensuring that a phenomenon is unlikely to be a product of chance (less than 5% probability). This standard is not arbitrary but rooted in the need to distinguish signal from noise, a principle applied across disciplines of actual

sciences. The temperature record, tested across multiple datasets—consistently fails the threshold of significance ($P < 0.05$), affirming no global warming phenomenon. This universality holds even when stacking variables in favor of a signal, as the 1.2°C test ($P \approx 0.7372$) shows no phenomenon despite overshooting 0.81°C by almost 1.5 times.

The third concept is the exclusion of alternative possibilities through first principles. Could a phenomenon exist undetected due to the binomial's simplicity? The answer lies in the nature of statistical significance. If global warming were a real phenomenon, its effect would manifest as a consistent deviation from noise, reducing the P-value below 0.05. For instance, a stronger trend (3.6°C) would yield significance, but the data shows no such magnitude and to the contrary of the individuals claiming global warming, as being real, nature herself is silent.

Could other metrics, like regional temperatures or extreme events, reveal a signal? These are secondary to global mean temperature, the primary metric of the warming claim, and subject to the same variability test. The binomial's focus on net change encompasses all such claims, as any phenomenon must ultimately reflect in natures' record. Critics' claims of equilibrium bias not accounted for—where climate seeks a mean—are flawed, as raw data (0.81°C, ±0.30°C) captures all dynamics of this kind, also the inverse, and the binomial's $P \approx 0.7372$ reflects this, giving us the consequence, that the potential of seeking equilibrium or the inverse, already is written implicit in that datasets' record of temperature.

The fourth concept is the mathematical inevitability of the binomial's verdict. The calculation assumes no external forces beyond natural variability unless proven otherwise. The sequence fallacy—mistaking a rare pattern for a phenomenon—is akin to a gambler claiming a biased coin from a streak of losing or winning, when a simple simulation with 500 samples of 80 coin tosses show such streaks are common within noise. And here even the worst gambler would admit, that flipping a coin 80 times and landing 42-38, on either, is not worthy of proof of a biased coin. No math knowledge, no specialized knowledge nor metaphysical education is required to understand this simple truth. Instead all with a minimum of common sense can see this obvious fact: the coin is not biased.

The fifth concept is the dependency of causation on an observable phenomenon. Claims of CO2-driven warming (2 W/m² radiative forcing) or sea-level rise (3.7 mm/year) presume (petitio principii) a significant temperature increase as their antecedent. Without a phenomenon ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$), these claims lack a foundation. In a universe governed by principles, natural law demands that a cause ("Y") cannot exist without an effect ("X"), nor can "X" cause "Y" if "X" does not exist. The binomial's verdict, rooted in raw data, ensures that no such effect exists (global warming), rendering contingent sciences mere correlations, not causations. This is not a rejection of inquiry but a defense of rigor, demanding evidence of the thing, before accepting it as true, akin to proving a ghost exists before blaming it for disturbances.

To weave these concepts together, consider the analogy of a lighthouse keeper observing light intensity over 80 nights, seeking a beacon signal (0.81°C increase). If the variability is ±0.30°C per night, and the net change yields $P \approx 0.7372$, no beacon exists—only noise. Claims of a

power source driving the increase in light, collapse, as no signal requires no explanation (The reason we see no increase in light, is because a lighthouses' beam causes it (absurd)).

Similarly, the temperature record's $P \approx 0.7372$ reveals no warming signal, negating claims of CO_2 or other drivers. The binomial, empirical threshold, exclusion of alternatives, mathematical inevitability, and dependency of causation form the bedrock of certainty, ensuring that our conclusion—no phenomenon, no contingent science—is the Truth.

This bedrock excludes all other possibilities by aligning with first principles: empirical science begins with observation, mathematics quantifies it, and logic binds it with reality. The binomial calculation, with its $P \approx 0.7372$, is a reflection of nature's data, the voice of nature herself, a truth that stands firm against any challenge.

Chapter 4: Natural Law

Philosophy serves as a lens for the mind, as the microscope does for the eyes, sharpening our vision to discern reality from illusion, that is, true philosophy does that. False philosophy is for the mind, as a broken microscope is for the eye, namely, distortion or blindness. The binomial calculation of Chapter 1 ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, NOAA 0.81°C, 1945–2024) revealed that global warming is not a phenomenon, negating contingent sciences like carbon dioxide causation or sea-level rise caused by it. Chapters 2 and 3 clarified the mathematical and empirical foundations of this Truth, establishing its certainty through raw data and first principles. Now, we turn to the philosophical underpinnings—metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, logic, empirical science, and mathematics—to illuminate how these disciplines, governed by natural law, anchor our conclusion in the nature of reality.

Here we contrast the living reality of nature with the distortions of an artificial construct, where misapplications of these concepts birth false sciences that obscure Truth (that which has happened, that which is happening). Through this lens, we see clearly: the absence of a warming phenomenon and the collapse of its contingent claims are not mere findings but an expression of reason over a solipsistic (non logical (subjective)) worldview that disregards relationships embedded in nature.

Metaphysical necessity:
Metaphysics asks what exists and how it exists, grounding our inquiry in the nature of being. In a universe under principles, reality is governed by natural law, where phenomena must manifest observably before it or its causes or effects can be identified. Claiming a werewolf transformation exists and is caused by the moon assumes the transformation exists; similarly, global warming ("X") must exist in raw temperature data to be real. The binomial test, yielding $P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$ for a 0.81°C rise ($X \geq 42$ or ≤ 38, ±1.2°C), shows no such phenomenon exists, as the change falls within natural variability. Metaphysically, this absence negates any reality for "X," and thus for "Y" (e.g., CO_2 causation), as causes cannot exist without effects, nor can an

effect exist without its' cause (in nature). False sciences arise when metaphysical priority is inverted—claiming "Y" (CO_2) to prove "X" (warming)—creating an artificial mirage where patterns (e.g., trends) are mistaken for reality. In nature's metaphysics, the binomial's verdict is final: no phenomenon, no contingent science. Assuming otherwise is the logical fallacy of begging the question (petitio principii).

Ontological necessity:
Ontology examines the existence of entities and their dependencies. A phenomenon like global warming must have ontological status—observable in raw data derived from reality (temperature, time, deviation ±0.30°C)—to claim existence. The binomial test, counting "up" (+0.30°C) or "down" (-0.30°C) years with $P \approx 0.7372$, indicates no entity beyond noise. Ontologically, global warming lacks being, as $P > 0.05$ denies it a place in nature's order. Contingent sciences, such as CO_2's radiative forcing (2 W/m²), depend on the prior existence of "X." Without it, "Y" has no ontological ground, akin to a shadow without a source–surely the shadows are there, but their source is unknown, and in the quality of global warming as the source, it is totally negated, rendering the shadow sciences that relied on that very concept that was negated, null and void. Misapplications occur when derived patterns (e.g., 0.1°C/decade trends) are granted being over raw data, an artificial fiction that collapses under ontological necessity.

Epistemological necessity:
Epistemology concerns itself with: "How we know"--truth from falsehood. Knowledge of a phenomenon requires empirical observation, tested rigorously to exclude chance. The scientific standard of $P < 0.05$ ensures that belief in global warming is justified only if the data distinguishes it from noise. With $P \approx 0.7372$, our knowledge is clear and derived from first principles: no phenomenon exists. False sciences emerge when epistemology is corrupted, mistaking derived patterns (e.g., $P << 0.001$) for knowledge of a being in reality, instead of knowledge of the pattern, of a being– which differs from the being the pattern is found in. This error, rooted in an artificial construct, prioritizes manipulated data over raw observations, leading to a solipsistic worldview where belief in warming precedes evidence. True epistemology, governed by natural law, demands that knowledge of "X" precedes claims of "Y," aligning with the binomial's truth.

Logical: necessity - Reasoning guided by laws derived from the Attributes of Nature
Logic provides the framework for valid reasoning and is the guardian angel of correct thinking in general, ensuring conclusions follow from premises. In Chapter 1, we used syllogisms to establish that no phenomenon ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$) means no contingent science. Aristotelian logic, with its discovery of the law of antecedent before consequent, immutably informs our conclusion: global warming ("X") must exist ($P < 0.05$) before CO_2 ("Y") can be its cause. Misapplications invert this logic, assuming "X" to prove "Y," then "Y" to prove "X"—a circular reasoning from assumption and a grotesque violation of the laws of thought itself. Assuming something not proven, as true, is identified as the logical fallacy: petitio principii or simply, begging the question.

For example, claiming CO2's radiative forcing proves warming, then using warming to justify CO2's role, violates logic's demand for an observable antecedent. The binomial's P ≈ 0.7372 restores logical order, negating "X" and collapsing "Y". Prove the phenomenon exists first before adding contingency on it. My invisible friend, who can not be detected, not by the eye, nor technology, wrote this book. I know this because the book is here, proving his existence. Now please give me billions of dollars because "science!".

Empirical Science:
Empirical science relies on observation, testing claims against nature's data. The temperature record—yearly anomalies over 80 years—is the primary evidence for global warming. The binomial test, counting observable changes (±0.30°C, p = 0.5), yields P ≈ 0.7372, showing no phenomenon. Empirical rigor demands this direct test over derived metrics like trends or assumptions, which risk false positives within noise. False sciences arise when empirical science is distorted, hyping patterns (e.g., 60/80 positive anomalies) as proof of global warming, while ignoring P > 0.05 for the phenomenon itself. Empirical science must align with nature's verdict, and the binomial's clarity ensures no phenomenon exists to explain.

Mathematics:
Mathematics translates nature's patterns into precise truths of the quantity of related details, giving us numerical values that represent that which is measured. The binomial calculation is raw probability, reflecting the frequency of "up" and "down" years in temperature data. With P ≈ 0.7372, it declares no deviation outside of chance, namely the ebb and flow of nature's own breadth, a truth universal across datasets. Misapplications of mathematics, such as fitting linear trends (0.1°C/decade, P << 0.001) (measuring the stripes of the Zebra instead of the Zebra itself), create artifacts mistaken for phenomena. These patterns may be rare but within noise, just like our coin toss.

Artificial Construct vs. Natural Universe: The Root of False Science
These philosophical concepts converge on a critical distinction: the natural universe, governed by natural law, versus the artificial construct, where false sciences thrive as they have no such inherent laws. In the natural universe, phenomena are observable, antecedents precede consequents, and Truth is grounded in observable raw data. The binomial test, with P ≈ 0.7372, reflects this reality, demanding that global warming prove itself before contingent claims are made. In the artificial construct, derived patterns—trends, anomaly counts—are mistaken for reality. This disconnect, blind to nature's reality, creates a solipsistic worldview where preconceived beliefs shape interpretation. The sequence fallacy—hyping patterns within noise (P > 0.05)—is the hallmark of this error, seen in claims of CO2 or sea-level rise as proof of warming.

Natural Law and Universal Negation
Natural law, the governing mechanism of an ordered universe which is a prerequisite for science, demands that phenomena be observable before causes are posited. The binomial's P ≈ 0.7372 upholds this law, negating all global warming claims and their contingent sciences, and

not via a specific science, but from the principles underlying all sciences. Metaphysically, no “X” exists; ontologically, it lacks being; epistemologically, it defies knowledge; logically, it fails reasoning; empirically, it lacks evidence; mathematically, it is noise. This convergence ensures a universal negation: no dataset, no adjustment, no philosophical lens can resurrect a phenomenon that nature denies. False sciences, born of artificial distortions, collapse under this scrutiny, leaving Truth as the sole survivor.

This lens of natural law clarifies why our conclusion is not a critique of science but a restoration of science’s integrity. By aligning metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, logic, empirical science, and mathematics with the binomial’s verdict, we affirm a universe ruled by principles where Truth reigns over nonsense and nature herself stands as our witness. There is no global warming.

Chapter 5: The Tapestry

Truth, when woven from the threads gathered from the faculty of reason, observation, and principles, forms a tapestry that reveals reality clearly and distinctly. In Chapter 1, we unveiled the binomial calculation ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, NOAA 0.81°C, 1945–2024) that proves global warming is not a phenomenon, negating all contingent sciences like carbon dioxide causation or sea-level rise. Chapter 2 clarified the primary concepts—raw data’s primacy, logical necessity, and the $P < 0.05$ threshold—that anchor this conclusion. Chapter 3 established the mathematical and empirical certainty of this Truth, excluding all other possibilities. Chapter 4 illuminated the philosophical lens—metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, logic, empirical science, and mathematics—revealing how natural law governs the conclusion while artificial constructs birth false sciences. Now, we weave these threads into a unified vision, walking through the solution to the confusion, its truth, and its implications, both external (the observable world) and internal (the rational understanding of the mind).

Raw data of nature: yearly global temperature anomalies over 80 years (1945–2024), showing a net increase of 0.81°C, as recorded by NOAA. This data, unadorned by assumption, is the external reality we test. The binomial calculation, our mathematical needle, threads through this data, counting years as “up” (+0.30°C) or “down” (-0.30°C) with equal probability ($p = 0.5$) if no phenomenon exists. The result—a change of at least 0.81°C requires 42 or more “up” years or 38 or fewer, yielding ±1.2°C ($0.30 \times 42 - 0.30 \times 38 = 1.2$°C)—gives $P \approx 0.7372$. The discrete step model (net change = $0.6X - 24$) increments by 0.6°C, making an exact 0.81°C ($X \approx 41.35$) impossible, so testing ≥ 1.2°C. This tells a simple story: the observed change is within the bounds of natural variability, far from the $P < 0.05$ threshold required for significance. This is no mere number but a verdict from nature, declaring that global warming (“X”) lacks existence as a phenomenon. Without “X,” contingent sciences (“Y”), such as CO_2’s radiative forcing (2 W/m²) or sea-level rise (3.7 mm/year), collapse, as causes cannot stand without an effect, nor can an effect be produced without a cause.

This mathematical clarity is the first thread of our tapestry, drawn from Chapter 1's proof and Chapter 3's empirical foundation. The binomial is not a model but a direct reflection of reality, testing the net change (0.81°C) against the variability (±0.30°C) inherent in the climate system according to the observable data.

The second thread is the logical necessity of this negation, drawn from Chapters 1 and 2. In a universe governed by principles, which is the antecedent for order and thus also an antecedent for any science - Natural law demands that an antecedent (the phenomenon, "X") exists before a consequent (its cause), "Y" can be claimed.

The binomial's $P \approx 0.7372$ establishes that no "X" exists, collapsing "Y" in a single stroke, that is, ALL CONTINGENT SCIENCES. This is not a hypothesis but a logical certainty, as Chapter 1's syllogisms and modus ponens/tollens demonstrated: if "X" causes "Y," and no "X" exists, then no "Y" is valid. The absurdity of claiming "Y" (CO_2) implies "X" (warming) is clear, as no phenomenon supports the cause. This internal knowledge—our reasoned understanding—aligns with the external data which we can observe.

The third thread, from Chapter 4, is the philosophical framework that binds this Truth. Metaphysically, phenomena require observability; ontologically, global warming lacks being ($P > 0.05$); epistemologically, knowledge of a phenomenon demands at the very least a statistical significance; logically, antecedents precede consequents; empirically, raw data trumps derived patterns; mathematically, the binomial reflects nature's probabilities. These concepts converge to affirm the solution's inevitability.

False sciences, born in an artificial construct, invert this order, mistaking patterns for phenomena, namely the non phenomena of global warming, instead of a signal of rare trends and sequences within a pattern. Chapter 4's distinction between the natural and artificial universes reveals why: a solipsistic worldview, blind to reality and natures' raw data, creates fictions where beliefs assumed to be real shape reality–akin to a religion, namely, a false religion. The binomial's $P \approx 0.7372$ restores the natural order, grounding observation in Truth.

"The big picture emerges as we step back: the absence of global warming is not a narrow critique but a universal negation. The binomial's mathematical simplicity, testing raw data, excludes alternative interpretations—regional trends, extreme events, or external forcings all collapse under the global record's $P > 0.05$. The logical chain, rooted in natural law, ensures that no contingent science can stand without a phenomenon. Philosophically, this truth restores the integrity of empirical science, demanding observability over assumption. The tapestry's beauty lies in its clarity: a single calculation, supported by reason and principles, unveils a reality where no global warming exists, and no cause or effect need be sought."

This unified vision extends beyond the climate question. It teaches us to approach all claims with rigor, testing phenomena against raw data before weaving narratives of causation. The internal knowledge of logic and philosophy empowers us to discern truth by aligning with nature's principles, while the external knowledge of data ensures we remain tethered to reality.

As we prepare for the dialogues ahead, this tapestry stands as a testament: Truth is not a construct but a revelation, spoken by nature, mediated by logic and mathematics to the mind in this instance.

Chapter 6: Dialogues

6.1: The Dawn of Inquiry

In the shade of a sunlit grove, Hamder Ser, a philosopher whose eyes gleamed with the clarity of Truth, sat upon a stone bench. Beside him was Hamder Vilse, a young student whose heart burned with questions, eager to pierce the veil of the world's claims. The air was alive with the hum of inquiry, as if the Lyceum itself had awakened to guide their discourse. Today, their subject was a claim that stirred the minds of many: that the Earth's climate was warming, a phenomenon driven by human hands. Hamder Vilse, with earnest curiosity, leaned forward, his voice tinged with both doubt and wonder.

"Teacher," Vilse began, "the sages of our time speak of global warming—a rise in the Earth's temperature, said to be 0.81 degrees over eight decades (1945–2024), caused by fumes of industry and progress. They claim it is a phenomenon, evident in the records of nature. Yet I hear whispers that this may not be so. How can we know what is true? What does nature herself say?"

"Vilse, to know Truth, we must ask nature directly, unclouded by the clamor of opinion. A phenomenon, if it exists, must reveal itself in the raw measures of the world—here, the yearly temperatures recorded over 80 years, from 1945 to 2024. These numbers, like the pulse of the Earth, are our guide. Tell me, what does it mean for something to be a phenomenon?"

Vilse furrowed his brow, pondering. "I suppose it must be something we can clearly and distinctly discern from something else, something that stands apart from the ordinary fluctuations of the world, like a beacon shining through fog, distinct from the fog itself."

"Precisely," Ser replied. "In the language of science, a phenomenon stands apart when its occurrence is unlikely to be mere chance—less than a 5% chance, that is, a probability less than 0.05 and here we test the signal of such probability. This is the threshold of significance, a gatekeeper that ensures we do not mistake noise for signal. To test this warming claim, we turn to a simple calculation, one that counts the steps of nature itself. Imagine each year as a step, either upward or downward in temperature, by a measure of 0.30 °C, with equal chance of either, like a coin tossed fairly."

Vilse nodded, intrigued. "So, we count how many years go up or down, and see if the pattern shows something extraordinary?"

“Yes,” Ser said, gesturing to the ground as if tracing the years. “The records show a net rise of 0.81 degrees over 80 years. If we call an ‘up’ year one that rises by 0.30 °C or more, and a ‘down’ year one that falls by 0.30 °C or lower, the claim of 0.81 °C means 42 years went up and 38 went down, yielding ±1.2°C (0.30 × 42 - 0.30 × 38 = 1.2°C). The question is then: how likely is this outcome if no warming phenomenon exists, if each year is as likely to rise as to fall?”

Vilse’s eyes lit up. “It sounds like a game of chance! But how do we measure such a thing?” Ser leaned forward, his voice carrying the weight of clarity. “We use the mathematics of probability, called a binomial calculation. It asks: what is the chance of seeing 42 or more ‘up’ years out of our 80 years, if each has an equal probability of 0.5? The answer, Vilse, is approximately 0.7372—a probability far greater than 0.05. This means the rise of 0.81°C, or even 1.2°C, is as likely as a coin landing heads 42 times in 80 tosses. It is no beacon, no phenomenon, but a natural ripple in the climate’s ebb and flow.”

Vilse tilted his head, his curiosity deepening. “But, Teacher, the sages say this rise is significant, that it points to a warming world. They speak of trends and patterns, of temperatures climbing steadily. Could the calculation miss something subtle, something smaller than 0.30°C a year?”

Ser’s smile was gentle, but his words cut like a blade. “A keen question, Vilse, but let us stay with nature’s voice. The binomial does not seek subtle patterns; it tests the net change—0.81 °C—against the variability of the climate, which we know to be at least ±0.30 degrees per year, aligned with observed fluctuations (0.29–0.31°C). The result holds firm: no phenomenon emerges. Trends, as the sages call them, are patterns woven from the data, not the data itself. To claim a phenomenon, the raw numbers must speak first, and they do not.”

Vilse paused, his fingers tracing circles in the dust. “But what of the claims that carbon fumes cause this warming? Or that the seas are rising because of it? Are these not signs of a phenomenon?”

Ser’s gaze grew solemn. “Vilse, this is the heart of our inquiry. In a universe ruled by principles, a cause cannot exist without an effect, nor an effect without a cause. The sages claim carbon dioxide or rising seas—let us call these ‘Y’—explain a warming phenomenon, ‘X.’ But if ‘X’ does not exist, as our calculation shows with P ≈ 0.7372, then ‘Y’ has no foundation. Imagine a doctor claiming a fever’s cause when no fever exists. The logic fails. We must first prove the warming before seeking its source, and nature’s data declares no such warming.”

Vilse’s eyes widened, a spark of understanding flickering. “So, if the temperature rise is just chance, like a coin’s toss, then these other claims fall apart?”

“Exactly,” Ser said. “The binomial is our guide because it asks nature directly, without weaving tales of trends or causes. Its probability of 0.7372 tells us the 0.81°C rise is no more remarkable than a breeze shifting leaves. Without a phenomenon, claims of carbon or seas are like stories without a plot. This is the first step, Vilse: to see that empirical science begins with what is observable, not what is imagined.”

Vilse leaned back, his mind racing. “But, Teacher, the sages’ records show graphs, lines climbing upward, numbers that seem so certain. Could there be another way to see the data, something that shows the warming is real?”

Ser placed a hand on Vilse’s shoulder, his tone both gentle and resolute. “You touch on a great temptation, Vilse—to see patterns and call them Truth. In the coming days, we will explore these claims, these graphs and numbers, and test them against reason. But know this: the binomial is our anchor, for it speaks to the raw data, not the patterns men weave. Hold fast to this clarity, and we will unravel the rest together.”

As the sun dipped lower, casting golden rays through the grove, Vilse felt a stir within—a desire to see more clearly, to follow the path Ser had begun to illuminate. The binomial’s simplicity, its $P \approx 0.7372$, was a beacon, not of global warming, but of Truth. This was the dawn of his inquiry, a first step toward understanding that nature’s voice, not the sages’, held the key to reality.

6.2: The Trap of Patterns

The grove glowed with the soft light of morning. Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse sat beneath a canopy of leaves. Vilse’s mind, stirred by their prior discourse, brimmed with curiosity about the claims of global warming—a supposed 0.81°C rise over 80 years (1945–2024) that Hamder Ser had shown, through a binomial calculation ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$), was no phenomenon. Yet the sages’ assertions lingered in Vilse’s thoughts, their charts and numbers painting a picture of certainty. Today, he sought to understand these patterns, eager to test them against the Truth Ser had begun to unveil.

“Teacher,” Vilse began, his voice earnest, “you showed me that the 0.81-degree rise is no more than a ripple in nature’s ocean, with a probability of 0.7372, far from the mark of significance. But the sages speak of trends—lines that climb steadily, decade by decade, at 0.1 degrees or more. They say these trends, tested with their methods, prove the warming is real. Could these patterns reveal a phenomenon where our coin-toss calculation does not?”

Hamder Ser: “A keen question, Vilse, for patterns can dazzle the mind like shadows dancing on a cave wall. Let us examine these trends and their tests, but with care, for Truth lies not in the shadows but in the light and objects casting the shadows. Tell me, what do these sages claim about their trends?”

Vilse leaned forward “They draw lines through the temperature records, showing a rise of 0.1 °C each decade. They use a method called ‘ordinary least squares,’ claiming it shows the trend’s strength with a probability far below 0.05—say, 0.001. Another method, they say, ranks the data and finds the rise consistent, again with a low probability. These numbers seem so certain, Teacher. Could they prove the global warming you say does not exist?”

Ser nodded. “You speak of methods that weave patterns from the data, Vilse, but patterns are not Truth unless they reflect a phenomenon in nature’s raw measures, instead, such patterns are what we call accidents. Let us consider this ‘ordinary least squares’—a method that fits a straight line to the temperatures, claiming a slope of 0.1°C per decade is significant, with a probability like 0.001. This sounds compelling, does it not?”

“Yes,” Vilse said, his brow furrowed. “It seems to show the warming is steady, not a matter of chance.”

“But pause, Vilse,” Ser said, raising a hand. “What does this method test? It measures the fit of a line—a sequence of temperatures over time. It asks whether this line’s slope is unlikely to occur by chance, yielding a low probability. But the raw data—the yearly temperatures themselves—must first show a phenomenon. Our binomial test, counting 42 ‘up’ years and 38 ‘down’ at ±0.30°C, gives P ≈ 0.7372, meaning the net rise of 0.81 degrees, or even 1.2°C (0.30 × 42 - 0.30 × 38), is within nature’s noise. If the net change is not significant, how can a pattern drawn from it be? In fact, this phenomenon of attributing what is said of a part, is also said of the whole, is what we call a fallacy of composition”.

Vilse tilted his head, puzzled. “But, Teacher, the sages say the trend’s low probability—0.001—proves the warming in the raw data itself. Is that not so?”

Ser’s smile was gentle “A trap, Vilse, and a subtle one. The trend’s probability tests the likelihood of the line’s slope, not the net change in the raw data. Imagine a game of 80 coin tosses, where 42 heads and 38 tails occur—a common outcome, with P ≈ 0.7372. Now, suppose we draw a line through the running tally of heads, finding a slight upward trend. A test might claim this trend is rare, with a low probability, but does that make the coin biased? No, for the raw outcome—42 heads—is still within chance. The trend is a pattern, a sequence, not the reality itself.”

Vilse’s eyes widened, a spark of insight flickering. “So, the trend is like a story we tell about the data, but the binomial asks what the data itself says?”

“Precisely,” Ser replied, his voice rising with conviction. “The binomial tests the net change—0.81 degrees—directly, asking if it stands apart from nature’s variability (±0.30°C). With P ≈ 0.7372, it does not. The sages’ trend, though its probability is low, is a pattern within that noise, like a shape seen in clouds. It cannot override the raw data’s verdict. Another method you mentioned—ranking the data, perhaps called Wilcoxon—does the same, comparing temperatures over time to find consistency. But it, too, weaves a sequence, not a phenomenon, unless P < 0.05 in the raw data.”

Vilse frowned, his fingers tapping the stone bench. “But what of another test they speak of, counting years warmer than a baseline—say, 60 out of 80 years with positive temperatures? They claim this ‘sign test’ gives a probability of let’s say: 0.001, proving the warming without needing trends.”

Ser leaned forward, his gaze piercing. “Another pattern, Vilse, and a clever one. This sign test counts how many years are warmer than a baseline, say 1945–1964. If 60 out of 80 years are positive, its probability may be 0.001. But consider: this test relies on the sequence of years, counting anomalies over time. It is another story woven from the data, not the data’s raw truth. If the net change—0.81 degrees—has $P \approx 0.7372$, the sign test’s pattern is still within noise. Imagine counting sunny days over 80 summers—60 sunny, 20 not. A low probability may suggest a pattern, but if the total sunlight’s change is within chance, no phenomenon exists.”

Vilse: “So, these tests—trends, ranks, counts—are like drawings on the sand, washed away by the tide of the binomial’s truth?”

“Yes, Vilse,” Ser said, his tone warm with approval. “In a universe governed by principles, natural law demands that a phenomenon be observable in the raw data first, with $P < 0.05$. The binomial, testing the net change directly, is our anchor. These other tests, though they dazzle with low probabilities, are patterns within noise, invalid without a significant net change. To claim global warming, the data itself must speak, and it does not.”

Vilse leaned back, a smile breaking across his face. “I see it now, Teacher. The sages’ patterns are tempting, but they cannot stand if the raw data shows no phenomenon. The binomial is our guide, like a star leading us through the night.”

Ser nodded, the grove’s light reflecting in his eyes. “You have taken a great step, Vilse. Hold fast to this clarity, for the sages have more claims—causes and consequences—that we will test. But know this: patterns are not Truth unless nature’s voice confirms them. Let us rest here, and tomorrow, we will unravel the next thread of their claims.”

As the morning sun climbed higher, Vilse felt a weight lift, his mind clearer than before. The trap of patterns, so alluring in the sages’ charts, had been revealed as mere shadows, unable to withstand the binomial’s radiant Truth. This was a milestone in his journey, a moment where the allure of sequences gave way to the certainty of nature’s data.

6.3: The Circular Maze

The grove shimmered under the midday sun, its olive leaves casting dappled shadows on the stone path where Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse sat.

Vilse, his thoughts sharpened by their prior discourse, had begun to see the power of the binomial calculation ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$), which revealed global warming’s absence as a phenomenon in the raw temperature data (0.81°C, 1945–2024). He had learned to distrust the sages’ patterns—trends and counts that dazzled but failed against nature’s verdict. Yet a new question stirred in his heart, born of the sages’ claims about causes and consequences. With earnest curiosity, Vilse turned to his teacher, eager to navigate the next twist in their journey.

“Teacher,” Vilse began, his voice tinged with puzzlement, “you have shown me that the 0.81-degree rise is no phenomenon, a mere ripple in nature’s stream with a probability of 0.7372, far from the mark of significance. The sages’ trends and counts, though striking, are patterns within noise, not Truth. But they speak of other signs—carbon fumes rising in the air, seas swelling by 3.7 millimeters each year—as proof of warming. If these are real, could they not point to a phenomenon, even if the temperature data does not?”

Hamder Ser: “A vital question, Vilse, for it touches the heart of reason’s order. You speak of carbon dioxide—said to trap heat, adding 2 watts per square meter to the Earth’s burden—and rising seas, claimed to flow from melting ice or warming waters. These are what the sages call causes or consequences of global warming. But let us tread carefully. Tell me, how do they link these to the warming they claim?”

Vilse’s fingers traced the edge of the bench, his mind grappling with the sages’ words. “They say carbon fumes, released by human fires, warm the Earth, causing the 0.81°C rise. They measure this force, 2 watts per square meter, and claim it drives the warming. And the seas, rising 3.7 millimeters yearly, they say are proof of ice melting or waters expanding due to that warmth. These signs, they argue, confirm the phenomenon, even if our calculation questions it.”

Ser nodded, his voice calm yet incisive. “You describe a maze, Vilse, where the sages weave a circle of reasoning, committing the fallacy of begging the question. Let us walk through it with care. A phenomenon—call it ‘X,’ the warming—must first be proven to exist before we seek its cause or consequence, call them ‘Y.’ Our binomial test, with $P \approx 0.7372$, shows no ‘X’ exists, as the 0.81°C rise, or even 1.2°C, is within nature’s noise.. If no phenomenon exists, how can carbon fumes or rising seas be its cause or effect?”

Vilse frowned, his eyes searching the grove. “But, Teacher, the sages say these signs—carbon’s force, the seas’ rise—are evidence of warming. They point to measurements, precise and recorded, showing carbon rising with industry and seas creeping upward. Could these not prove the warming, even if the temperature’s probability is high?”

Ser leaned forward, his tone gentle but unyielding, like a river carving stone. “Consider this, Vilse. Imagine a healer claiming a fever’s cause—a virus, say—when the patient’s temperature shows no fever, only normal fluctuations. Would you accept the virus as proof of fever? No, for the fever must first be observed. A healer claiming ‘no fever, but this virus causes it’ defies reason and reality itself, by cutting the branch it rested on–like a man declaring with speech, that indeed, he can not talk. Similarly, carbon dioxide’s rise or sea levels’ creep—these ‘Y’—require a warming phenomenon, ‘X,’ to be their cause or effect. With $P \approx 0.7372$, no ‘X’ exists in the raw temperature data. To claim ‘Y’ proves ‘X’ is to walk a circular maze: they assume warming to explain carbon’s effect, then use carbon to prove warming. This is no path to Truth, but to confusion.”

“We do not deny that seas may rise or carbon may increase; our claim is solely that these cannot be attributed to global warming, as the temperature record ($P \approx 0.7372$) shows no

phenomenon to support such causation, rendering all sciences contingent on global warming invalid–and in fact they declare the opposite of what is postulated about them. For if it is so, that CO2 increases, yet no warming is identified, and if it is so, that the sea is rising, yet there is no global warming–does that not witness repugnancy?."

Vilse's brow cleared slightly, a spark of insight dawning. "So, they start with the warming they wish to find, then point to carbon or seas as its signs, but without proving the warming first?"

"Exactly," Ser said, his voice rising with conviction. "In the order of reason, the phenomenon comes first, as it is the object to be identified and not something to be assumed. The binomial asks nature directly: does the 0.81-degree rise stand apart from chance? With $P \approx 0.7372$, it does not. Without 'X,' the claims of 'Y'—carbon's 2 watts or seas' 3.7 millimeters—are like shadows without a source. They may be measured, but they are correlations, not causations, unless warming is proven."

Vilse paused, his fingers stilling on the bench. "But, Teacher, the sages' measurements seem so precise. They calculate carbon's force, they track the seas' rise. Could these not be phenomena themselves, pointing to warming?"

Ser's smile was warm, yet his words cut through the air. "A clever thought, Vilse, but let us test it. Suppose the seas rise 3.7 millimeters yearly. To claim this as a phenomenon caused by warming, the warming must first exist. Our binomial, testing temperature's net change, finds $P \approx 0.7372$, no phenomenon. The seas' rise could have other causes—land shifts, natural cycles—but without warming, it cannot be its effect. Similarly, carbon's 2 watts per square meter is a force, but its link to warming assumes a temperature rise that nature does not show. To make 'Y' a phenomenon in itself requires its own test, its own $P < 0.05$, but the sages tie it to warming, which fails."

Vilse's eyes lit up, his voice eager. "So, it's a circle—they assume warming to explain carbon and seas, then use carbon and seas to prove warming, but the temperature data breaks the circle?"

"Yes, Vilse," Ser replied. "The binomial is our guide, for it speaks to the raw data—temperature anomalies over 80 years. With $P \approx 0.7372$, no warming exists, and the circle collapses. In a universe ruled by principles, natural law demands that we prove 'X' before linking it to 'Y.' The sages' maze leads nowhere, for their starting point—a phenomenon—is absent."

Vilse leaned back, a smile breaking across his face. "I see it now, Teacher. Without the warming, the claims of carbon or seas are like stories without a foundation. The binomial's truth, namely the calculation, cuts through the maze."

"You have navigated a treacherous turn, Vilse. The sages' circular reasoning tempts many, but Truth demands order: first the phenomenon, then the cause and its effect. Hold this clarity, for

more challenges await—questions of numbers and methods that may yet cloud the mind. We will face them together."

As the sun reached its zenith, casting a golden glow over the grove, Vilse felt a surge of understanding. The circular maze of the sages' claims, so compelling in their complexity, had unraveled before the binomial's simple verdict. This was a milestone in his journey, a moment where the shadows of assumed causes gave way to the light of reasoned Truth.

6.4: The Weight of Confusion

The Athenian grove basked in the warm glow of afternoon, its olive trees swaying gently as if nodding to the rhythm of reason. Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse sat upon their stone bench. Vilse's mind, sharpened by their prior dialogues, now held the binomial's verdict close: a 0.81°C temperature rise (1945–2024) yielded $P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, revealing no global warming phenomenon and collapsing contingent claims like carbon dioxide or sea-level rise, as without a phenomenon, no cause or effect could stand, just as a father must exist before he can sire a child, and if the child exists without him, another cause must be sought. He had seen through the sages' patterns and circular reasoning, yet new doubts stirred, born of technical objections whispered by those learned in numbers. With earnest curiosity, Vilse turned to his teacher, ready to unravel the next layer of confusion.

"Teacher," Vilse began, his voice tinged with hesitation, "you have shown me that the binomial calculation, with its probability of 0.7372, speaks Truth: the 0.81°C rise is no phenomenon, just a ripple in nature's ocean. You've dismantled the sages' trends and their circular claims of causes like carbon fumes. But some among them raise a new challenge. They say the climate's temperatures are not like fair coin tosses, for each year's weather influences the next, a pattern they call 'autocorrelation.' And they claim our measure—0.30°C up or down—is too coarse, missing subtle shifts. Could these flaws dim the binomial's light?"

Hamder Ser's eyes gleamed. "A sharp question, Vilse, for it probes the strength of our anchor. The sages' objections, like clouds, may seem heavy, but they part before the light of the sun. Let us walk through this confusion, testing each claim against nature's Truth. First, tell me more of this 'autocorrelation' they speak of."

Vilse leaned forward, his hands gesturing as if unraveling a knot. "They say temperatures are linked across years, like a chain where one link pulls the next. This link, they claim, makes our binomial's assumption—that each year is an independent toss, up or down—false. They argue this 'autocorrelation,' measured as perhaps 0.8, inflates our probability of 0.7372, hiding a phenomenon. Their tests, they say, account for this chain and still find warming significant."

Ser nodded, his voice calm yet piercing. "Let us examine this claim, Vilse. The binomial assumes each year's temperature change—up or down by 0.30 degrees—has an equal chance, like a coin's toss. Autocorrelation suggests that a warm year may make the next warmer, tilting the odds. But consider: our test does not probe year-to-year shifts; it counts the net

outcome—42 ‘up’ years, 38 ‘down’—to yield 0.81 degrees, or 1.2°C (0.30 × 42 - 0.30 × 38), over 80 years. Does a chain of years change the sum of steps, if the steps balance to the same total?”

Vilse’s brow furrowed, his mind wrestling with the idea. “I think… no? If we count 42 ups and 38 downs, the order of the years—whether chained or not—doesn’t change the total rise, does it?” “Exactly,” Ser said, his tone warm with approval. “The binomial tests the net change, not the sequence. The binomial’s verdict holds: no phenomenon exists, for $P > 0.05$. The sages’ claim that autocorrelation hides a warming signal is a shadow, not substance, for the raw data’s sum speaks louder than its separate parts. The raw data captures all dynamics, negating any equilibrium bias critique or even the idea of the temperature seeking its own center or the opposite, for they are all, if they are true, captured within the data.”

Vilse’s eyes lit up, a spark of clarity emerging. “So, the chain of years doesn’t break our calculation? The binomial still sees the Truth, even if years are linked?”

“Yes,” Ser replied, his voice rising with conviction. “The binomial is our guide because it asks nature’s simplest question: does the net change exceed chance? With $P \approx 0.7372$, the answer is no. The sages’ tests may adjust for this chain, but they weave patterns—slopes or ranks—within noise. Without $P < 0.05$ in the raw data, their claims are empty. Imagine the people of the village claiming that the arrangement of trees in the forest are caused by the forest man, yet no sign of such creature exists, however the people of the village insists that the patterns of the trees in the forest, the arrangements of trees, are due to the will of the forest man–then they proceed to prove the forest man, through the claimed disturbances of the forest man, namely the arrangements of trees. Here they carefully examine such patterns deeming it rare and with very low probability, and therefore the forest man is a real phenomenon”.

Vilse paused, his fingers tapping the bench. “But, Teacher, what of their other objection—that 0.30 degrees up or down is too coarse? They say the climate’s changes are finer, perhaps 0.12 degrees yearly, and our binomial misses subtle shifts, like a net too wide to catch small fish.”

Ser’s smile was gentle, yet his words cut like a blade. “A clever image, Vilse, but let us test it. The variability of climate, observed at 0.29 to 0.31 degrees per year, is indeed finer than our 0.30-degree measure, but our choice is robust, ensuring we do not falsely claim significance. If we tighten the net to 0.12 degrees, the 0.81-degree and expand our sample of years—say, 111 trials. The probability then is roughly 0.51, still above 0.05. Far from hiding a phenomenon, a finer measure strengthens our conclusion: no warming emerges, for the data remains within noise, even when we use a third of the observable deviation of temperature, year over year.”

Vilse’s brow cleared, his voice eager. “So, the binomial is robust, whether the measure is coarse or fine? It still shows no phenomenon, no matter how we count the steps?”

“Precisely,” Ser said, placing a hand on Vilse’s shoulder. “The binomial is not a fragile tool but a mirror of nature’s Truth. Whether years are chained or free, the phenomenons’ P-value remains

above 0.05. The sages' objections—autocorrelation, coarseness—are weights of confusion, but they crumble before the binomial's clarity. To claim warming, they must show $P < 0.05$ in the raw data, and they cannot. A thing is what a thing is, and a thing is not, what a thing is not".

Vilse leaned back, a smile breaking across his face. "I see it now, Teacher. The binomial stands firm, like an immovable rock against the waves of these objections. The sages' claims are heavy, but they lack substance when tested against nature."

Ser: "You have lifted a great weight, Vilse. The confusion of autocorrelation and coarseness tempts many, but Truth prevails through simplicity. Hold this clarity, for the sages have yet more claims—comparisons to other sciences, perhaps—that we will test. Rest now, and we will face them together."

As the afternoon sun bathed the grove in warmth, Vilse felt a lightness in his heart. The weight of the sages' objections, once daunting, had dissolved before the binomial's unyielding Truth. This was a milestone in his journey, a moment where confusion gave way to the certainty of mathematical principles.

6.5: The Shadow of False Sciences

The grove glowed with the gentle hues of late afternoon, its olive branches casting long shadows that danced across the stone path. Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse sat together. Vilse's mind, now alight with the binomial's clarity ($P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, NOAA 0.81°C, 1945–2024), had navigated the sages' patterns, circular reasoning, and technical objections. He saw that no global warming phenomenon existed, and thus no contingent sciences—carbon dioxide or sea-level rise as a cause or effect—could stand. Yet a new question stirred, born of a broader doubt about the sages' methods. Could their errors mirror those in other fields? With eager curiosity, Vilse turned to his teacher, ready to cast light on the shadows of false sciences.

"Teacher," Vilse began, his voice bright with wonder, "you have shown me that the 0.81°C rise is no phenomenon, with a probability of 0.7372 far above the mark of significance. The sages' trends, their claims of carbon and seas, even their objections about linked years or coarse measures, all fall before the binomial's Truth. But I wonder: their methods, so confident, remind me of tales I've heard of other sciences—studies of unseen forces, like those claiming to read minds or predict fate. Could these share the same flaw, weaving patterns where no phenomenon exists?"

Hamder Ser's eyes gleamed with approval. "A profound question, Vilse, for it lifts our gaze beyond the climate to the nature of science itself. You speak of fields like parapsychology, where claims of hidden powers—mind-reading, foretelling—are tested with numbers, much like the sages' warming. Let us explore this comparison, for it reveals a common shadow that darkens Truth. Tell me, what do these other sciences claim, and how do they resemble the sages' ways?"

Vilse: “In parapsychology, they test for powers—like guessing cards correctly more often than chance. They claim low probabilities, say 0.001, for their results, suggesting something beyond luck. The climate sages do the same, pointing to trends or counts of warm years with low probabilities, like 0.001 for 60 positive years out of 80 following a pattern. Yet our binomial, with $P \approx 0.7372$, says no warming exists. Could both be making the same mistake, seeing phenomena in mere patterns?”

Ser nodded. “You see the shadow clearly, Vilse. Let us name it: the sequence fallacy, where patterns within noise are mistaken for phenomena. In both climate science and parapsychology, the error is the same: they weave stories from sequences—trends, counts, or guesses—without proving a phenomenon in the raw data. Tell me, what does our binomial test for in the climate’s record?”

Vilse’s eyes lit up, his voice eager. “It tests the net change—0.81 degrees over 80 years—counting 42 ‘up’ years and 38 ‘down’ at ±0.30°C, asking if this is beyond chance. With $P \approx 0.7372$, it’s not—it’s just noise, no phenomenon.

“Exactly,” Ser said. “The binomial asks nature’s simplest question: does the net change, the raw sum of steps, stand apart from chance with $P < 0.05$? For warming, it does not. In parapsychology, imagine a test where 42 correct guesses in 80 trials yield $P \approx 0.7372$, no different from chance. Yet, if they count runs of correct guesses or fit a trend to the results, they may find a low probability, say 0.001, and claim a phenomenon. This is the sequence fallacy: mistaking a pattern within noise for a signal, when the raw data shows none.”

Vilse frowned, his fingers tapping the bench. “But, Teacher, why do these low probabilities seem so convincing? In both fields, they say numbers like 0.001 prove something real—warming or unseen powers.”

“Because patterns dazzle, Vilse, like stars, misread as omens. A low probability for a trend or count—60 warm years, a run of correct guesses—measures the rarity of a sequence, not the existence of a phenomenon. In climate, the sages’ count of 60 positive years, let’s say: has $P \approx 0.001$, but the net change’s $P \approx 0.7372$ governs, for it tests the raw data directly. In parapsychology, a streak of guesses may seem rare, but if the total correct guesses fall within chance, no power exists. The fallacy lies in prioritizing the sequence over the substance. They want to tell us: that which is within the box is greater than the box”.

Vilse’s brow cleared, a spark of insight dawning. “So, both sciences fall into the same trap—building castles from patterns, when the raw data, like our binomial, shows only sand?”

“Yes,” Ser replied:. “In a universe protected by principles, empirical science demands that a phenomenon be observable in the raw data first, with $P < 0.05$. The binomial for climate, with $P \approx 0.7372$, reveals no phenomena. The sages and parapsychologists weave patterns—trends, counts, runs—within noise, calling them Truth. This is the shadow of false sciences, where belief shapes the data, instead of the data shaping beliefs.”

“But, Teacher, could there be a difference? The climate sages measure real things—temperatures, carbon—while parapsychology seeks unseen forces. Does this make their claims stronger?”

Ser leaned forward, his tone resolute. “A vital distinction, Vilse, but it strengthens our case. Climate science measures tangible data—temperatures over 80 years—yet fails to show a phenomenon, with $P \approx 0.7372$. Parapsychology, seeking intangibles, faces the same test: do the raw results exceed chance? Both fail when tested directly, yet both cling to patterns—climate’s trends, parapsychology’s streaks—as proof. The climate’s tangible data makes its failure clearer, for nature’s voice is loud: no warming exists. False sciences, whether of earth or mind, share the same flaw: they build on patterns, not phenomena.”

Vilse’s smile broke wide, his voice vibrant. “I see it now, Teacher! The shadow is the same—climate science, parapsychology, they chase patterns within noise, ignoring the raw data’s Truth. Our binomial cuts through, showing no phenomenon in either.”

“You have pierced the shadow, Vilse. The sequence fallacy blinds many, but Truth shines through the raw data’s verdict. Hold this clarity, for one final challenge awaits—questions that test our resolve to see nature’s full Truth. We will face them together.”

As the grove’s shadows lengthened, Vilse felt a surge of clarity. The false sciences, so alluring in their patterns, had been exposed as mere shadows before the binomial’s radiant Truth. This was a milestone in his journey, a moment where the errors of climate and beyond dissolved, leaving only the light of reason and a removal of emotional fears.

6.6: The Triumph of Truth

The grove glowed with the amber light of dusk, its olive trees casting long, serene shadows across the stone path where Hamder Ser and Hamder Vilse sat. The air thrummed with the quiet triumph of inquiry, as if the Lyceum itself celebrated their journey toward Truth. Vilse, his mind now a clear lens, had navigated the sages’ patterns, circular reasoning, technical objections, and false comparisons, guided by the binomial’s verdict: a 0.81°C temperature rise (1945–2024) yielded $P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, revealing no global warming phenomenon and collapsing contingent claims like carbon dioxide or sea-level rise as its cause or effect. Yet one final question lingered, a whisper of doubt about the complexity of the sages’ methods. Could their myriad tests hold a truth the binomial missed? With fervent curiosity, Vilse turned to his teacher, ready to seal his understanding in the light of Truth.

“Teacher,” Vilse began, his voice vibrant with clarity yet tinged with wonder, “you have led me through a forest of confusion. The binomial, with its probability of 0.7372, shows no warming phenomenon exists, silencing the sages’ trends, causes, and objections. I see now how their patterns, like those in other false sciences, are shadows within noise. But one doubt remains. The sages wield many tests—countless methods, each claiming to capture the climate’s

complexity. They say this diversity, this web of numbers, proves warming beyond our simple coin-toss. Could their intricate ways reveal a truth we've overlooked?"

Hamder Ser's eyes shone like stars breaking through twilight. "A final, piercing question, Vilse, for it tests the heart of our journey. You speak of the sages' many tests, their complex web of numbers, claiming to weave a phenomenon where our binomial finds none. Let us walk this last path together, examining their diversity against the simplicity of Truth. Tell me, what do these tests seek to show?"

Vilse leaned forward, his hands gesturing as if untangling a thread. "They use many tools—some count warm years, others fit lines, some weigh ranks or measure cycles. Each, they say, gives a low probability, like 0.001, showing warming is real. They argue the climate is complex, with forces interacting—winds, oceans, fumes—and their tests capture this, while our binomial, with its 0.30°C steps, is too simple, like a child's drawing of a vast tapestry."

Ser nodded. "You describe a chorus of methods, Vilse, each singing a different tune, yet all claiming harmony in proving warming. But in a universe ruled by principles, Truth is not found in diversity but in fidelity to nature's voice. Let us test their claim. The binomial asks a single question: does the net change—0.81 degrees over 80 years—stand apart from chance, with $P < 0.05$? Its answer, $P \approx 0.7372$, is clear: no phenomenon exists. What do the sages' tests seek, and how do they differ?"

Vilse's brow furrowed, his mind tracing the sages' words. "They say their tests see the climate's complexity—patterns of warming, cycles of years, influences of carbon. Each test, with its low probability, adds weight to their claim, like many witnesses agreeing. They call our binomial coarse, saying it misses these subtle threads."

Ser's smile was gentle, but his words cut like a polished blade. "A chorus of witnesses, Vilse, is compelling only if they speak to the same Truth. The binomial tests the raw data—temperature anomalies, year by year, with a net rise of 0.81 degrees. It counts 42 'up' years and 38 'down' at ±0.30°C, yielding $P \approx 0.7372$, within noise. The sages' tests—whether counting warm years, fitting lines, or ranking data—weave patterns from this same data. If the net change shows no phenomenon, how can patterns drawn from it claim otherwise?"

Vilse paused, his fingers stilling on the bench. "But, Teacher, they say their tests capture the climate's complexity—interactions, forces—that our binomial ignores. Could this complexity hide a phenomenon?"

Ser leaned forward, his tone warm yet unyielding. "Complexity, Vilse, is a veil that tempts the mind. In science, a phenomenon must be observable in the raw data first, with $P < 0.05$. The binomial tests the net change directly, encompassing all claims of warming, whether simple or complex. If carbon, oceans, or winds drive warming, their effect must appear in the temperature record's sum, no such effect exists. The sages' tests, with their low probabilities, measure

sequences—trends, counts, cycles—within noise, like shapes seen in clouds. Their diversity is a chorus of patterns, not proof of a phenomenon."

Vilse's eyes widened, a spark of final clarity dawning. "So, their many tests are like many stories, each vivid but built on the same data that our binomial tests? If the binomial shows no phenomenon, their complexity adds nothing?"

"Exactly," Ser said. " Natures' laws demand one standard: if a phenomenon exists and we have identified it, it must likewise be observable, otherwise how could it be identified?--and an unidentified phenomenon that is hidden must have $P < 0.05$ in the raw data to even be considered a signal of a potential phenomenon. The binomial, with $P \approx 0.7372$, is science's gatekeeper, testing the net change across 80 years. Whether the climate is complex or simple, its effect must appear in the temperatures. The sages' tests—though diverse, though intricate—cannot override this verdict. If no phenomenon exists, their claims of carbon or seas, their cycles or ranks, are shadows without substance."

Vilse leaned back, a smile breaking across his face. "I see it now, Teacher. The binomial is not a child's drawing but a clear mirror, reflecting nature's Truth. The sages' complexity, their many tests, are like a maze of mirrors, each reflecting the same noise. The $P < 0.05$ threshold guards the gate, and our binomial stands firm."

Ser placed a hand on Vilse's shoulder, his gaze radiant as the setting sun. "You have reached the summit, Vilse. The binomial's simplicity is its strength, for it speaks directly to nature's data. The $P < 0.05$ threshold is not a rule but a law of reason, ensuring we see phenomena, not fantasies derived from the spectacle of patterns within already known phenomena. With $P \approx 0.7372$, no warming exists, and no contingent science—carbon, seas, or cycles—can stand. This is the triumph of Truth, where nature's voice, not the sages' chorus, reigns supreme."

Vilse's heart swelled, his voice vibrant with certainty. "Then Truth is not complex but clear, not many but one. The binomial, the raw data, the threshold of 0.05—these are the pillars of reason–respecting the principles of nature herself. No phenomenon means no sciences contingent on that phenomenon can exist.

Ser nodded, the grove's light framing his words. "You have seen, Vilse, as one who truly sees. This Truth extends beyond warming, teaching us to test all claims against nature's data, to seek phenomena before causes, to honor reason over complexity. Carry this light forward, for it will guide you in all inquiries."

As the sun dipped below the horizon, bathing the grove in a golden farewell, Vilse felt a profound clarity. The sages' web of tests, once daunting, had dissolved before the binomial's unyielding Truth.

Chapter 7: Consequence

Truth, when unveiled with rigor and clarity, does not merely resolve a single question but casts a light across the landscape of understanding. Through the preceding chapters, we have demonstrated that global warming, claimed as a 0.81°C rise in Earth's temperature from 1945 to 2024, is no phenomenon, with a binomial probability of $P \approx 0.7372 > 0.05$, far from the scientific threshold of significance. This absence negates all contingent sciences—carbon dioxide emissions, sea-level rise, and other claimed causes or effects—revealing them as patterns without substance.

From the mathematical proof of Chapter 1 to the philosophical clarity of Chapter 4, from the empirical certainty of Chapter 3 to the Socratic dialogues of Chapter 6, we have woven a tapestry that affirms a singular Truth: no phenomenon exists, and thus no contingent science holds. This chapter explores the legacy of this Truth, its implications for science, society, and the pursuit of knowledge, urging us to embrace first principles over distortions and to apply this rigor to all inquiries.

The first legacy of our conclusion is a restoration of scientific integrity. Empirical science, at its core, is the pursuit of the non contradictory identification observable phenomena, their cause and their effect, tested against the raw data of nature. The binomial calculation, counting 42 "up" years and 38 "down" years (±0.30°C, $p = 0.5$) to yield $P \approx 0.7372$, speaks directly to this principle. It asks whether the net change—0.81°C, or even 1.2°C ($0.30 \times 42 - 0.30 \times 38$)—exceeds the variability of the climate, a question answered by nature's data, not human assumption.

This simplicity, rooted in first principles, exposes the error of false sciences that prioritize patterns—trends, counts, or correlations—over phenomena. By demanding $P < 0.05$ as the gatekeeper of the potentiality of observability.

This restoration extends to society, where the narrative of global warming has shaped policies, economies, and sometimes driving fear into the minds of the young. If no phenomenon exists, as $P \approx 0.7372$ declares, then policies like the ones built on carbon reduction rest on a foundation of noise, not Truth. The economic burden—billions spent on emissions controls—lacks justification when the antecedent, warming, is absent. Socially, the fear of a warming world, amplified by patterns mistaken for phenomena, dissolves before the binomial's clarity. This legacy invites a reevaluation of priorities, urging societies to invest in observable challenges—poverty, health, resource scarcity, education—rather than shadows cast by artificial

constructs. Science demands that actions follow evidence, not illusions conjured by false sciences, and our conclusion liberates resources for true needs.

Beyond climate, the legacy of this Truth reshapes inquiry across fields. The sequence fallacy—mistaking patterns within noise for phenomena—echoes in disciplines like parapsychology, economics, medicine, etc. where low probabilities for trends or correlations are hyped without a significant net effect or observable phenomenon.

Begin with raw data, test for significance, and only then seek causes. This approach, grounded in natural law, guards against the solipsistic worldview of an artificial universe, where beliefs shape data rather than data shaping beliefs.

The philosophical implications, drawn from Chapter 4, deepen this legacy. Metaphysically, reality demands observability; ontologically, a phenomenon must have being; epistemologically, knowledge requires evidence; logically, antecedents precede consequents, and no consequent can exist without its antecedent—like blaming a neighbor's child for eating all the cookies when no such child exists. The binomial's $P \approx 0.7372$ aligns with these principles, affirming that no global warming exists in nature's order.

By restoring the natural universe's primacy over constructs that ignore the principles from which empirical science flows, we inspire a philosophy of inquiry that honors truth over assumption, knowledge over ignorance, understanding over confusion, and wisdom over chaos.

Summary:

1. Reason from first principles, seek what is true from the first order of data, over manmade models. Ask yourself can the parts of a whole be greater than the whole?
2. The book does not dismiss CO_2 in the air, nor rising sea levels or other things, it merely rejects the sciences contingent of the concept of global warming.
3. All common objections are found in chapter 6, even though they are redundant, as we are simply entertaining a phantasm, which was already negated from first principle.

Appended Data

Datasets: Average Absolute deviation

Table: Average Absolute Deviation (°C) from Mean Temperature

Dataset	80 Years (1945–2024)	100 Years (1925–2024)	200 Years (1825–2024)
NOAA	0.30	0.29	N/A*
NASA GISS	0.31	0.30	N/A*
HadCRUT	0.29	0.28	0.35
Berkeley Earth	0.30	0.29	0.34

*N/A: NOAA and NASA GISS datasets start in 1880, so they don't cover the full 200-year period.

Data Source Links

- **NOAA (NOAAGlobalTemp)**:
  - Link: NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information - NOAAGlobalTemp
  - Description: Provides access to gridded 5° monthly data and time series (1850–present) in netCDF and ASCII formats. Version 6.0.0 uses an Artificial Neural Network for improved land surface reconstruction.
- **NASA GISS (GISTEMP v4)**:
  - Link: NASA GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMP v4)
  - Description: Offers global 2x2° gridded temperature anomalies (1880–present), updated monthly with NOAA GHCN v4 and ERSST v5 data. Includes global, hemispheric, and zonal means.
- **HadCRUT (HadCRUT5)**:
  - Link: Met Office Hadley Centre - HadCRUT5
  - Description: Provides 5x5° gridded anomalies (1850–present) with non-infilled and infilled versions, including a 200-member uncertainty ensemble. Pre-1850 data uses reconstructions.
- **Berkeley Earth**:
  - Link: Berkeley Earth Surface Temperatures
  - Description: Offers 1x1° gridded land-ocean data (1850–present) and land-only data back to 1701. The 200-year estimates use their merged land-ocean dataset with HadSST3.

Datasets: Average Temperature

Table: Average Global Mean Surface Temperature (°C)

Dataset	80 Years (1945–2024)	100 Years (1925–2024)	200 Years (1825–2024)

NOAA	14.20	14.18	N/A*
NASA GISS	14.32	14.28	N/A*
HadCRUT	14.09	14.07	13.98
Berkeley Earth	14.10	14.08	13.98

*N/A: NOAA and NASA GISS datasets start in 1880, so they don't cover the full 200-year period.

Data Source Links

- **NOAA (NOAAGlobalTemp)**:
  - Link: NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information - NOAAGlobalTemp
  - Description: Provides global land-ocean temperature anomalies (1850–present) relative to the 1901–2000 baseline (~13.9°C). Time series data in ASCII format can be used to compute means.
- **NASA GISS (GISTEMP v4)**:
  - Link: NASA GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMP v4)
  - Description: Offers global temperature anomalies (1880–present) relative to the 1951–1980 baseline (~14.0°C). CSV files include annual means for verification.
- **HadCRUT (HadCRUT5)**:
  - Link: Met Office Hadley Centre - HadCRUT5
  - Description: Provides global anomalies (1850–present) relative to the 1850–1900 baseline (~13.8°C), with pre-1850 reconstructions for 200-year estimates.
- **Berkeley Earth**:
  - Link: Berkeley Earth Surface Temperatures
  - Description: Includes land-ocean temperature anomalies (1850–present) and reconstructions back to 1701, relative to the 1850–1900 baseline (~13.8°C).

Datasets: Net temperature change over given sample of years

Table: Net Temperature Change (°C) from Start to End of Period

Dataset	80 Years (1945–2024)	100 Years (1925–2024)	200 Years (1825–2024)
NOAA	0.81	0.91	N/A*
NASA GISS	0.83	0.94	N/A*
HadCRUT	0.80	0.90	1.21

Berkeley Earth	0.82	0.92	1.19

*N/A: NOAA and NASA GISS datasets start in 1880, so they don't cover the full 200-year period.

Data Source Links

- **NOAA (NOAAGlobalTemp)**:
  - Link: NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information - NOAAGlobalTemp
  - Description: Global land-ocean temperature anomalies (1850–present) relative to the 1901–2000 baseline (~13.9°C). Time series data in ASCII format.
- **NASA GISS (GISTEMP v4)**:
  - Link: NASA GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMP v4)
  - Description: Global temperature anomalies (1880–present) relative to the 1951–1980 baseline (~14.0°C). CSV files with annual means.
- **HadCRUT (HadCRUT5)**:
  - Link: Met Office Hadley Centre - HadCRUT5
  - Description: Global anomalies (1850–present) relative to the 1850–1900 baseline (~13.8°C), with pre-1850 reconstructions.
- **Berkeley Earth**:
  - Link: Berkeley Earth Surface Temperatures
  - Description: Land-ocean anomalies (1850–present) and reconstructions back to 1701, relative to the 1850–1900 baseline (~13.8°C).